UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/595,989	05/24/2006	Rami Evron	PHUS030466US2	1420	
	7590 11/03/201 LLECTUAL PROPER	EXAMINER			
P. O. Box 3001			SANEI, MONA M		
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2882			
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			11/03/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/595,989	EVRON, RAMI	
Examiner	Art Unit	
MONA M. SANEI	2882	

	MONA M. SANEI	2882	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 12 October 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, www. with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the siset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory period for reply original for the hortened statutory period for reply original for the hortened statutory period for reply original for the hortened statutory and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory and the corresponding amount of the	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the second con	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); er form for appeal by materially rec	E below); lucing or simplifying th	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s).	·		•
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 1,3-11,20 and 21. Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 8-10 and 12-19. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. \square The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.
 REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Mona M Sanei/ Examiner, Art Unit 2882	/Hoon Song/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2882	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

By virtue of the amendments to the claims, the claim objections set forth in the Final mailed August 17, 2010, have been overcome.

By virtue of an amendment, claim 12 now recites "the target required noise level". This phrase lacks proper antecedent basis. It is noted that parent claim 8 includes the limitation "a targeted noise level". Claims 13-19 are rejected by virtue of their dependencies.

By virtue of the amendments to the claims, the 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶2 claim rejections of claims 17 and 19 set forth in the Final mailed August 17, 2010, have been overcome.

Applicant's arguments filed October 12, 2010, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant asserts that claim 8 requires using body mass index to determine the target radiation dose for a scan and "not after scanning" and that the target radiation dose is determined and selected "before" performing the scan as the x-ray diagnostic examination of the patient is performed (pg. 8). Examiner would like to respectfully point out that these features (see specifically those phrase in quotes) upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claim. It is noted that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. It is also noted that method claim 8 does not include claim limitation that would require the steps of the method to be performed in the order in which they are presented. For this reason, applicant's assertion is not persuasive and the rejection is being maintained.